

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application; all claims have been rejected. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,774,866 (Horwitz) and Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,617,526 (Oran) and Horwitz. Claims 1-5 are independent claims.

The second paragraph on page 2 of the Office Action, states that: Claims **2 and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Horwitz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,774,866. The following paragraphs, however, detail rejections of Claims **1-3 and 5**. In a telephone interview, the Examiner verified that the second paragraph on page 2 of the Office Action should read: Claims **1-3 and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Horwitz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,774,866.

The present application describes a user interface in a portable terminal wherein a user can directly invoke an intended function using state indicators, e.g., an RSSI (Received Signal Strength Indicator), alarm setting, arrival of an SMS (Short Message Service) message, a battery state, and call reservation setting, displayed as unique images on a portable terminal display, as well as view the state representation of the state indicator, so that it is not necessary to designate a separate key for the function.

Horwitz describes a computer system, which checks for conflicts associated with proposed new matters in an organization, which deals with numerous clients. The system compares data concerning potential relationships of a party to the organization with data denoting existing relationships and identifies potential problem situations where the client in a potential matter is the same as the client in an existing matter.

The Examiner cited column 21, lines 1-15 and lines 26-30 of Horwitz as teaching the registering element of the inventive claims, e.g., “registering the related function for the state indicator when a state change to be reflected in the representation of the state indicator occurs”, as recited in Claims 1, 2, and 3; and “registering an alarm function for the state indicator when the alarm is set”, as recited in Claim 5. These sections of Horwitz were also cited to reject the invoking element of the inventive claims, e.g., “invoking the registered function upon receipt of

a user input for designating the state indicator”, as recited in Claim 1; “invoking the registered function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate the representation area of the state indicator”, as recited in Claim 2; “invoking the registered function when the cursor or input focus is positioned over the representation area of the state indicator”, as recited in Claim 3; and “invoking the alarm function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate the representation area of the state indicator”, as recited in Claim 5.

The cited sections of Horwitz read as follows:

“In the next stage 226, the system sends a potential conflict signal to the evaluator by dispatching such signal to the terminal associated with the evaluator. Whenever any match in conflict search result table 138 lists a particular individual as an evaluator, an alarm signal is sent to the terminal associated with that person. The local program executed by each terminal reacts to the alarm signal by causing the terminal to emit an audible beep or other sound, and also actuates the terminal to display a flashing icon on the terminal screen, indicating that there are conflict search results for the particular individual to evaluate. The evaluator can respond to the alarm signal by “double clicking” the icon or entering an appropriate series of keystrokes causing the local terminal 44 to call processor 20 to supply a list of potential matters which produced conflict for evaluation by the person.”; and

“When the evaluator actuates his or her terminal to respond to the alarm status flashing icon, as by double clicking the icon, the terminal displays selected information from the pending conflict list for the evaluator.”

These recitations do not teach the inventive method. Horwitz describes **static** assignments, e.g., by clicking on the alarm the evaluator always produces the same result, the same command is executed on a list of potential matters supplied. To the contrary, the registering element claimed in the present application produces **dynamic** results.

As an explanation consider the following example. In the present invention, when a message is received on a portable terminal, for example an SMS, an icon such as an envelope is displayed or highlighted on a screen of the portable terminal. At the same time, a function to display the received message is registered at the coordinates of the displayed envelope icon. The function is registered not prior to the event but **at the time (when)** the event occurs, e.g., a message arrives, alarm signals, etc. When a user presses on or positions a curser over the screen location of the envelope icon, the associated function is invoked or executed and the received message is displayed to the user. Further, after the display of the message, another function, e.g., listing all received messages, may be associated or registered with the envelope icon. Horwitz, in the above presented section or elsewhere in its specification does not teach or describe the registration or invocation recitations of Claims 1-3, and 5.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 4, Oran provides a system visual notification area for displaying visual notifications, which provide to a user visual cues of the nature of the intended notification. The visual notifications may notify a user of events, status information, or other information.

The Examiner cited column 4, lines 20-30 and lines 42-50 of Oran as teaching the “registering a message reading function for the state indicator when the message arrives” and “invoking the message reading function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate the representation area of the state indicator”, recited in Claim 4.

However, Oran does not teach or describe the recitations of Claim 4 for the reasons discussed above with reference to Horwitz. Specifically, there is no discussion in Horwitz or Oran of **dynamically** assigning a function to an icon **at the time of** occurrence of an event or “registering a message reading function for the state indicator **when** the message arrives”, as recited in Claim 4.

Accordingly, the above-mentioned independent claims, namely Claims 1-5, are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. It is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1-5 be withdrawn. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the rejections of these claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-8484
(516) 228-8516 (Facsimile)